

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated November 16, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 10 and 15 have been amended, and claim 8 has been canceled. Moreover, the specification has been amended. The Applicant submits that the amendments made herein are fully supported in the specification and the drawings as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-7 and 9-19 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

### **Allowed Claims 16-19 and Allowable Subject Matter**

As a preliminary matter, the Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 16-19.

The Applicant further appreciates the allowable subject matter recited in claim 11 of the present application.

### **Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1, 3, 6-8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Luo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0203724, hereinafter "Luo"). Claims 1, 6 and 15 have been amended and claim 8 has been canceled. To the extent this rejection is still applicable, the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In making the rejection, the Office Action characterizes Luo as allegedly disclosing,

a receiver that includes “a band pass filter for setting a channel bandwidth of the received signal, the semiconductor device further comprising, a frequency controller (Figure 2, Item 212) connected to the band pass filter (Figure 2, Item 214) to set a center frequency of the band pass filter to a frequency corresponding to the channel bandwidth in accordance with the reference signal before the second control loop corrects the local frequency (Page 3, [0047-0048]). It is further noted that while Luo does not explicitly state that loop filter is a ‘band pass filter’ its function is equivalent to that of a band pass filter as is evident from the aforementioned citation.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the characterization of Luo and therefore traverses.

The Applicant submits that Luo fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1, 6 and 15 of the present application. For example, it is submitted that Luo fails to disclose at least a frequency controller (18) for setting a center frequency ( $f_0$ ) of a band pass filter (14) using a reference signal ( $f_{ref}$ ) as recited in claims 1, 6 and 15 of the claimed invention. In fact, Luo only discloses the comparison of the phase of the input clock signal from the reference frequency 104, to the phase of a feedback path of the first loop LOOP1 from the frequency divider 202, and locking the PLL 100 to the correct transmit channel frequency (e.g., 2.45 GHz).

Moreover, Applicant submits that in order to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Luo fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 6 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1,

6 and 15 are not anticipated by the disclosure of Luo. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6 and 16 are allowable.

As claim 3 depends from claim 1, and claim 7 depends from claim 6, the Applicant submits that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luo in view of Scarpa (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,186). Claim 10 has been amended. To the extent this rejection is still applicable, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Luo is discussed above with respect to claims 1, 6 and 15.

It is submitted that Luo in view of Scarpa fail to disclose a frequency controller (18) for setting a center frequency (fo) of a band pass filter (14) using a reference signal (ref), as recited in the claims of the present application, because Scarpa fails to cure these deficient features in Luo.

Moreover, claims 2, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1, and claims 10, 12-14 depend from claim 9, the Applicant submits that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 1-7 and 9-15 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. The Applicant also submits that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully requests that claims 1-7 and 9-15 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue along with allowed claims 16-19.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together

**<This Space is Intentionally Left Blank>**

with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 108075-00115.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang

Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372  
AREN'T FOX, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 857-6395

SH:ksm

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time (one month)